

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

**STEVEN RAY NELSON,**  
**ID # 1130776**

**Pe<sup>1</sup>titioner,**

**vs.**

**RICK THALER, Director,**  
**Texas Department of Criminal**  
**Justice, Correctional Institutions Division,**  
**Respondent.**

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

**No. 3:06-CV-1562-M (BH)**

**ECF**

**Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge**

**ORDER ACCEPTING FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS**  
**OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

After reviewing the objections to the Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge and conducting a *de novo* review of those parts of the Findings and Conclusions to which objections have been made, I am of the opinion that the Findings and Conclusions of the Magistrate Judge are correct and they are accepted as the Findings and Conclusions of the Court.

For the reasons stated in the Findings and Conclusions of the United States Magistrate Judge, through XII on page 26, the Court hereby **DENIES** with prejudice plaintiff's petition for habeas corpus.

In accordance with Fed. R. App. P. 22(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) and after considering the record in this case and the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that the petition be denied with prejudice, the Court **DENIES** petitioner a Certificate of Appealability. The Court adopts and incorporates by reference the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Conclusions filed in this case in support of its finding that the petitioner has failed to show (1) that reasonable jurists would find this Court's "assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong," or (2) that reasonable jurists would find "it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional

---

<sup>1</sup> In his objections, petitioner alludes to a "KUB" test, which is at page numbered 12 after page 9 of his petition. It relates to the tampering case, not the aggravated assault case petitioner challenges here. The KUB test, even if not properly before the Court, does not provide a basis for relief on the claims petitioner asserts in this matter.

right” and “debatable whether [this Court] was correct in its procedural ruling.” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).<sup>2</sup>

**SIGNED this 2nd day of November, 2010.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Barbara M. G. Lynn". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "B".

BARBARA M. G. LYNN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS

---

<sup>2</sup> Rule 11 of the Rules Governing §§ 2254 and 2255 Cases, as amended effective on December 1, 2009, reads as follows:

**(a) Certificate of Appealability.** The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant. Before entering the final order, the court may direct the parties to submit arguments on whether a certificate should issue. If the Court issues a certificate, the court must state the specific issue or issues that satisfy the showing required by 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). If the court denies a certificate, the parties may not appeal the denial but may seek a certificate from the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 22. A motion to reconsider a denial does not extend the time to appeal.

**(b) Time to Appeal.** Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 4(a) governs the time to appeal an order entered under these rules. A timely notice of appeal must be filed even if the district court issues a certificate of appealability.